DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 201 IR 007 862

AUTHOR Jensen, Larry; Zelig, Mark
TITLE Analyzing Value Content in Television Programs.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 35p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Abstract Reasoning; Affective Behavior; Behavior Rating Scales; *Commercial Television; *Moral Issues; *Moral Values; *Programing (Broadcast); *Television Research

ABSTRACT

Four prime time television programs--"Charlie's Angels," "Little House on the Prairie," "Grizzly Adams," and "Lou Grant" --were rated by university students for their portrayal of moral reasoning and values. Data were obtained from three episodes of each program by randomly assigning raters to one of two viewing groups, both of which used an adaption of Rokeach's system of instrumental and terminal values and a moral reasoning form based on the content categories of egoism, utilitarianism and deontology from Boyce and Jensen. Moral reasoning and value preferences are discussed within and between the programs. Between program differences are explained and trends apparent in the programs are discussed. (RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179201

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANALYZING VALUE CONTENT IN TELEVISION PROGRAMS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Larry Jensen

Utah State University

Mark Zelig

University of Alabama

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry Jensen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR007862

7/13

Moral Reasoning and Values Presented in

Television Programs

Abstract

Four prime time television programs were rated for their portrayal of moral reasoning and values. Data was obtained from three episodes from each show. Raters were randomly assigned to one of two viewing groups. Each group rated two of the four programs. The data revealed adequate test-retest reliabilities. Ratings of moral reasoning and values indicated that significant differences exist between programs; however, there was considerable consistency between three episodes of the same program.

Moral Reasoning and Values Presented in Television Programs[1]

In an era marked by Watergate and My Lai, the study of values and moral reasoning has become increasingly prominent. Kohlberg (1964) and Boyce and Jensen (1978) have noted the importance of studying the reasoning process whereby moral decisions are made. Rokeach (1973) believes that an individual's behavior is reflective of his or her value system. While the theoretical orientations of these investigators vary, all view the environment as influential in moral development. One of the most apparent environmental factors is exposure to television. Moreover, the voluminous data accumulated on the effects of television viewing have produced almost unequivocal evidence that television is a potent model for human learning and socialization.[2]

The past two decades have witnessed a great deal of research on the effects of television, (e.g., Bandura, Ross, and Ross, 1963; Liebert, 1974; Lyle and Hoffman, 1972; Atkin, Edison, and Korzenny, 1977; Fredrich and Stein, 1973, 1975; Stein and Fredrich, 1972; Sprafkin, Liebert, and Poulos, 1975). Even though the study of television effects is broadening its scope, a lack of data remains in the area of moral reasoning and values. Greenburg, et al. (1977) noted this deficiency in assessing motivation for pro-social acts in a content analysis study. "Here a systematic effort to identify motives and consequences for all postive and negative acts suggest that the majority of pro-social acts do not have evident motives, whereas most of the anti-social do" (pp. 61-62).

This lack of evident motives augments the difficulty of investigating moral reasoning and values, since moral reasoning is often deduced from observing the motivation of a television character. Second, the definition of moral reasoning and values is more difficult to establish than that of violence because the latter is an overt behavior while the concept of moral reasoning and values is subjective.

But, how does one assess the content of television? The majority of the literature has employed various schemes of content analysis. Content analysis was defined by Banks (1977), "as a technique that allows the objective, systematic, and quantitative analysis of communication material" (p. 377). Using this methodology, Banks studied the status of black characters on television programs. Franzblau, Sprafklin, and Rubenstien (1977) reported on televised sexuality after their raters assessed the content of videotaped television programs. Gerbner (1969) viewed videotapes of prime time programs and developed a comparative "violence index." Clark and Blackenburg (1972) employed a pair of trained raters to analyze TV Guide synopses from 1953 to 1969 to determine presence of violent content.

Developing a systematic and quantitative methodology for studying values and moral reasoning would face some extreme obstacles. Not suprisingly, content analysis studies of this area have largely eluded the published literature, although there exists speculation and anecdotal accounts. Generally, television has been described as promulgating middle class conventionality (Bogart, 1962; Chesebro and Hamsher, 1974; Himmelweit, Oppenheim, and Vince, 1958; Weigel and Jessor, 1973).

It is proposed here that there is a valid means to estimate what kinds of values and moral reasoning styles are presented on television.

To accomplish this task, a survey was first composed using thirteen value items extracted from Rokeach's system of instrumental and terminal values. A short, easy-to-learn listing was deemed necessary. The values categories selected were:

1. Motivated, ambitious, capable
2. Responsible, hard working, self-controlled
3. Broad minded, forgiving, considerate of others, loving
4. Intelligent, logical, independent, imaginative
5. Brave, courageous, valiant
6. Friendly, cheerful, easy going
7. Virtuous, honest, loyal, obedient, clean
8. Comfortable, secure
9. Accomplishment, service
10. Respect, friendship, love of people
11. Freedom, equality, justice
12. Salvation, eternal life
13. Pleasure, happiness, excitement

Moral reasoning was conceptualized from the theories of Boyce and Jensen (1978), whose model describes moral reasoning in philosophical terminology. The author extracted several of Boyce and Jensen's content categories to describe moral reasoning for this study. They are listed below:

1. Egoism: This category is applicable to one who is concerned with achieving his definition of the good primarily for himself. In his moral decisions, he will do that which will produce the desired consequences for himself regardless of its effect on others.

2. Utilitarianism: This tenet believes that the appropriate moral response is that which promotes the greatest good for the greatest number. The utilitarian, unlike the egoist, is concerned with other's welfare rather than himself. Altruistic behavior is witnessed within this division.

3. Deontology: In deontological reasoning, the individual considers first the nature of the action itself in determining "rightness."

the consequences of the contemplated action are not nearly as important as the action itself. The salient characteristics of the act itself determines the appropriate moral action.

By assessing these values and moral concepts as presented on four prime time public television programs, the following questions were researched:

1. What is the stability over time of two surveys completed approximately one month apart?

2. When four prime time television programs are selected is there a difference between these programs in regard to the values and moral reasoning displayed?

3. How consistent are the episodes of a selected program in its display of moral reasoning and values? Do these variables fluctuate as a function of the particular storyline of an episode?

Method

Raters

Raters consisted of three females and seven males enrolled in a senior psychology seminar at Brigham Young University. All subjects were white, Mormon, and ranged in age from 18 to 25 years. They all shared a middle-class background. The subjects participated in the experiment as an alternative to regular class requirements. The 10 subjects were randomly divided into two viewing groups.

Apparatus

Cassette videotapes were used to copy selected television programs directly off the appropriate network channels. These cassettes were replayed to the subjects through a videotape playback machine.

Procedure

The experimental design consisted of four stages. These were program selection, training of subjects, program viewing, and survey completion.

Program selection. Three successive episodes of four prime time television shows were selected. These shows were "Charlie's Angels," "Little House on the Prairie," "Grizzly Adams," and "Lou Grant." These were taped during March 1978. During this time the subjects were instructed to refrain from watching these programs.

Programs were used which appeared to vary in content and thematic style. "Charlie's Angels" is a crime drama, with three attractive female detectives as the main characters. "Little House on the Prairie" is based on the lives of a Minnesota farm family during the 1800s. "Grizzly Adams" centers around the adventures of a mountain man and his tame grizzly bear. A large Los Angeles newsroom is the setting for "Lou Grant." "Charlie's Angels" and "Little House on the Prairie" were arbitrarily assigned to compose the content for one group of subjects, and the latter two programs composed the second group.

Training of the subjects. Each subject received approximately 20 hours of training, divided equally between classroom instruction and actual television viewing experience. All subjects were furnished with a scoring manual which explained the moral reasoning model of Boyce and Jenson (1978). Concepts from Fotion (1968) and Frankena (1963) were included to elaborate on definitions and examples. An adaptation of Rokeach's (1973) value inventory composed a portion of the items on the television survey. Approximately four hours of the training were spent familiarizing the subjects with Rokeach's system of values.

Program viewing. Each subject watched six episodes from the two programs assigned to his respective group. These six episodes were viewed within one month. After a subject completed the regular viewing schedule, he was again required to view the episode he first viewed. The interim between the re-rating of the first episode was approximately one month. This was done to provide data for a test-retest reliability check. Experimental effects were also controlled by randomly assigning each subject a viewing schedule, which insured that the order in which episodes were presented would be counterbalanced. All tapes were replayed in the University library. This was done in an area where privacy and freedom from distraction could be provided.

Survey completion. The survey consisted of two forms, one of which contained an adaptation of Rokeach's values, and the other containing a moral reasoning form. Ratings were reported on a nine-point rating continuum from "not important" to "very important."

After the subject viewed a program he was required to complete the following forms:

1. Identification Sheet. This form identified the program, its main plot and characters.

2. Data Sheet. This form asked the subjects to record observed moral acts and assign them to their appropriate category.[4]

3. Value and moral reasoning survey. The survey forms listed the value or moral reasoning concept and then requested that one rating be made after each viewing.

The subjects were permitted to take notes and use their scoring manuals during the viewing.

Results

Reliability

The test-retest Pearson Product Moment correlation was derived from the comparison of the first episode watched by each subject with a second rating of this same episode one month later. The data was obtained on the 21 dependent variables of the moral reasoning and values survey. The test-retest reliability ranged from .33 to .82. These results are summarized in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The total test-retest correlation across all raters was .58. A correlated t test was also computed to see if any significant differences could be found between the first and second sets of data for each of the two viewing groups. None of the t values approached the .05 level of significance.

Inter-rater reliability was obtained by constructing a correlation matrix for each group. The results showed low but consistently positive correlations (.32) between the raters.

Program and episode analysis

To determine significant differences between the two programs in each viewing group, as well as their individual episodes, an analysis of variance was employed. The model for this computation was: Yijk = M + Si + F(i)J + e(ij)K. M represents the mean, S the four prime time programs, P one of the three episodes of the programs, and E (using five raters) as the error. A separate analysis of variance was computed for each of the 21 variables scored by each of the two viewing groups.

Several dependent variables were significantly different. In Tables 2 and 4 it can be seen that there are four and five differences on values, respectively.

Insert Tables 2 & 4
about here

Indicated in Table 3 is one difference on moral reasoning, and in Table 5 there are four significant differences on moral reasoning.

Insert Tables 3 & 5
about here

Because the order of the episodes were counterbalanced in the order of episode presentation, an interaction (PXS) was impossible; but the main effect for episode differences (S) in this model would reveal the interaction effect as well as the main effect for episode differences by inspecting the F ratios for S. Only four such F ratios were significant for the "Grizzly Adams" - "Lou Grant" viewing group. There was one significant difference for "little House on the Prairie" and "Charlie's Angels." In order to understand this effect, a Newman-Keul Sequential Range Test was employed (see Table 6). The results showed that only "Grizzly Adams" had any significant differences between the episodes within a single program series. The differences due to the (S) effect for all the other comparisons were always the result of individual program differences between the series as would be expected, and not between episodes in the same series.

Insert Table 6 about here

The differences found in the atypical episode of "Grizzly Adams" were contained in the two value categories of brave, courageous, and valiant; and virtuous, honest, loyal, obedient, and clean. The moral reasoning differences were found within the categories of the utilization of egoism, and the utilization of utilitarianism. This single finding combined with the significance of program differences suggests that between program differences of moral reasoning and values are evident; however, episodes within a program series are generally consistent.

Moral Reasoning and Value Differences

The results presented in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 indicate significant statistical differences between television programs. These will now be discussed separately.

"Little House on the Prairie" and "Charlie's Angels." Figure 1 is a profile illustrating the statistically significant differences found by the raters.

Insert Figure 1 about here

"Little House on the Prairie" obtained higher scores on six measures in the prosocial direction than "Charlie's Angels." Deontology was more frequently utilized in the former. It is evident that "Little House on the Prairie" highly values interpersonal skills and relationships; and the use of higher cognitive skills in dealing with one's milieu. Service and accomplishment are sought for.

Utilitarianism was the preferred style of moral reasoning on "Little House on the Prairie." This reasoning pattern can be seen in

the value preferences indicated. The moral reasoning displayed was found to be more responsive to an act, or the situational demands, than to a preconceived rule.

"Charlie's Angels" was dramatically different. The only two value categories in "Charlie's Angels" that were higher in the prosocial direction than "Little House on the Prairie" were those of brave, courageous, and valiant; and pleasure, happiness, and excitement.

"Charlie's Angels" was the only program where egoism was the most utilized type of moral reasoning; however, utilitarianism was the most reinforced type of reasoning. The author speculates that a pattern of a high utilization of egoism, coupled with high reinforcement of utilitarianism is a characteristic of many police dramas. "Charlie's Angels" episodes typically present the antagonist performing egoistic, criminal acts throughout the entire episode, only to be caught in the concluding minutes by the altruistic or utilitarian protagonist. Thus, egoism is finally punished.

"Grizzly Adams" and "Lou Grant." Notable, and sometimes complex, differences were revealed by the rating instrument. Figure 2 is a profile of the statistically significant differences. Both of these programs seemed to be concerned with moral issues, but could be differentiated by their individual style of moral reasoning.

Insert Figure 2 about here

"Grizzly Adams" had higher utilitarian scores as well as a higher frequency of moral reasoning based on a rule. Thus, moral decisions are made in hopes of securing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Usually the dilemma is solved by reverting to a rule that

dictates the remedy. "Grizzly Adams" egoism score was the lowest in the sample. Utilitarianism was the most highly reinforced reasoning style.

In the three episodes that were sampled, these trends were consistently reported. An examination of the episodes illustrates one episode centered around Adams (the main character) saving a wolf who was rejected from her pack. Later the grateful wolf returned to help Adams win a race in which a friend's mule was at stake. The opponent in the race lost, after employing trickery to gain victory. In another episode Adams extends his hospitality to a needy transient family. As the story progresses, Adams also aids a local Indian tribe in rescuing a crippled hawk, who represents an important religious symbol to their tribe. Adams and the hawk are later saved by a member of the transient family he earlier befriended. In the third episode Adams helps his Indian "blood brother" find his lost mule. He also assisted a young man find his father, who left the family after an argument. In the end, the family is reunited, and the mule is recovered. This is only accomplished by these parties crossing a deteriorating bridge to save the stranded mule. As the bridge begins to collapse into a deep gulch, the main characters save each other's lives by a collective display of altruism. All three episodes are consistent. Utilitarianism is reinforced and egoism is discouraged.

The values of being broad minded, forgiving, considerate of others, and loving was rated higher for "Grizzly Adams" across all programs. "Grizzly Adams" emphasized being friendly, cheerful, and easy going more greatly than "Lou Grant," at a statistically significant level. "Grizzly Adams" attained the highest score of any item on the survey, with a 8.2 on respect, friendship, and love of people.

"Lou Grant" presents a different pattern of moral reasoning but is likewise consistent from episode to episode. Even though utilitarianism is the preferred style of moral reasoning, deontology is heavily relied upon. The deontology score was higher than "Grizzly Adams" at a statistically significant level, as well as being higher across all programs. While "Grizzly Adams" was oriented toward using rules to make moral decisions, "Lou Grant" was dependent upon the act, or situational variables. Thus, "Lou Grant" tends to examine moral dilemmas in view of their individual situation and "Grizzly Adams" reacts by prescribing to a rule.

Interestingly, "Lou Grants'" moral dilemmas are also complex. Simple answers to dilemmas on "Lou Grant" are less available than on "Grizzly Adams." It should be noted that "Lou Grant" did utilize utilitarianism more frequently than deontology—what is remarkable is "Lou Grants'" relatively high reliance on the latter as most programs do not present much deontology.

"Lou Grant" did not have any statistically significant values which were scored higher than "Grizzly Adams" in the prosocial direction. Non-significant differences in the prosocial direction were apparent. These differences were evident in areas dealing with being motivated, ambitious, and capable; intelligent and logical; and in freedom, equality, and justice. "Grizzly Adams" was noticeably higher in all interpersonal values.

Discussion

Rater Limitations

As noted previously, the sample consisted of middle class university students who were all members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day

Saints. The subjects received training on the values and moral reasoning models, and we do not believe a strong bias existed. The reader should note that biases resulting from preconceived attitudes about the given programs themselves is possible. However, the episodes selected were not viewed by the raters prior to the experiment. While scores of other raters may have been different than the ten employed in this research, it is believed that the differences would be in the same direction resulting in results similar to those reported here.

Trends Apparent in the Selected Programs

Although we believed that the two rating groups would respond similarly to different programs, comparisons between the two groups (to find differences in programs) is not statistically justifiable. However, it is informative to simulataneously contrast and compare these four programs even if the findings must be considered only tentative.

"Grizzly Adams" and "Little House on the Prairie" seem to be the most similar. Value preferences and moral reasoning were comparable, with a heavy reliance on utilitarianism. "Grizzly Adams" was more oriented toward using rules as a basis for responding to a moral situation.

"Lou Grant" offered a storyline in which values and moral reasoning were employed in response to social issues. Interpersonal skills and relationships were the foci of "Little House on the Prairie" but were not stressed in "Lou Grant" or "Charlie's Angels."

"Charlie's Angels" was the most dissimilar. The authors consider this the only program of this sample devoid of prosocial value. It relied on egoism more than any other single category of moral reasoning. Interpersonal relationships were treated shallowly. "Charlie's Angels" neglected to display values which would be very accessible to a police

drawn; for example, the value categories of freedom, equality, and justice; and accomplishment and service.

Consistency of Episodes

The differences in values and moral reasoning have been demonstrated between programs; however, differences between episodes are very minimal. It would seem that moral reasoning styles and values preferences are extremely consistent from episode to episode. The Newman-Keul test revealed that only "Grizzly Adams" had any significant differences in values and moral reasoning. The differences noted in Table 6 are all in the antisocial direction in this individual episode. The writer feels that the presence of gambling, as evidenced in the race to regain the mule for Adam's friend, may have been the factor which caused the deviation.

These consistencies were evident even though the story line changed from each episode. When one examined the first "Grizzly Adams" episode, the values and morals present in the program almost predice the value and moral conflicts of the next episode. It would seem that ordinarily one episode is a sufficient sample in which to study an entire series. As noted previously, the consistency shown in "Grizzly Adams" can be seen in the other three programs.

Reinforcement

An important point was raised by the moral reasoning pattern on "Charlie's Angels," which was reported earlier. Egoism was the most frequently used style of moral reasoning, and utilitarianism received the highest degree of reinforcement. How will this paradoxical pattern affect the viewer? Will a great amount of egoism be counteracted by

lesser amounts of highly reinforced utilitarianism? It is known that reinforced models are more readily imitated than their punished counterparts (Bandura, et al. 1963); however, this pattern presents difficulties in identifying the actual reinforcement contingencies.[3] The author sees need to assess the effects of equivocal messages on a television audience.

Conclusion

A final point to be made in this investigation is provoked by the remarkable consistency of moral reasoning and value preference within episodes. Whose values are these? Are television audiences being subjected to passive indoctrination?

Earlier investigations have attempted to identify the responsibility for television content, although none have specifically focused on moral reasoning and values. Canton (1972) interviewed 24 people who were employed in network screen writing or in production. The members of his sample were reluctant to take responsibility for value content; however, they did feel pressure to conform to network edicts. Canton commented that:

> To remain in production, a producer must be able to conform to the changing directives of the networks. Those producers who are committed to particular artistic and ethical values have trouble remaining in the commercial field. . . . While the shows are in production, producers rarely consider the effects they may have on children. Most believe that those considerations are the networks' responsibility, or the parents, but not theirs. Respondents told the interviewers that the networks hire psychologists to study whether or not shows have negative effects (pp 266-272).

Leifer, Gordon, and Graves (1974) believed that advertisers influenced programming, by noting that over half of advertising revenue is purchased by only 25 national firms. Baldwin and Lewis (1972) countered this argument, showing the trend toward multiple advertisers for

any given program. They felt that influence of any one advertiser could be counteracted by the other.

It would appear that assigning responsibility for network values is an arduous task. Perhaps, the values and moral reasoning on television are a collective phenomena of the conscious or unconscious processes of several entities. However, the high consistency between episodes would imply that a directed effort, conscious or otherwise, is producing this regularity in programming. The author feels that research that correlates the producers and screen writers own values and moral reasoning with that displayed on their program would be valuable in understanding this observation.

Finally, since there are differences between programs, it would seem reasonable to research their influence on behavior. This broadens our understanding of television's influence on behavior.

In summary, this study has shown that the subjective topics of moral reasoning and values are not elusive to investigation. An instrument to measure these vaiables has been developed. Differences in moral reasoning and values and a consistency between episodes were found between programs.

REFERENCES

Baldwin, T. F. & Lewis, C. "Violence in Television: The Industry Looks At Itself." In G. A. Comstock & E. A. Rubenstein (eds.), Television and Social Behavior. Reports and Papers: Media Content and Control (Vol. 1). Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. "Vicarious Reinforcement and Imitative Learning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 601-607.

Banks, C. A. "A Content Analysis of the Treatment of Black Americans Television." Social Education, 41, pp. 336-342.

Bogart, L. "American Television: A Brief Survey of Findings." Journal of Social Issues, 1962, 18, 36-42.

Boyce, D., & Jensen, L. C. Moral Reasoning: A Psychological-Philisophical Integration. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Canton, M. G. "The Role of the Producer in Choosing Children's Television Content." In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubinstein, & G. A. Comstock (eds.) Television and Social Behavior (Vol. 1). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Chesbro, J. W., & Hamsher, C. D. "Communication, Value, and TV Series." Journal of Popular Culture, 1974, 8, 589-603.

Clark, D. G., & Blackenburg, W. B. "Trends in Violent Content in Selected Mass Media." In G. A. & E. A. Rubenstein (eds), Television and Social Behavior. Reports and Papers: Media Content and Control (Vol. 1).

Coates, B. & Hartup, W. .W "Age and Observational Learning." Developmental Psychology 1979, 1, 556-562.

Fetion, N. Moral Situations. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antiock Press, 1968.

Frankena, W. K. Ethics. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.

Franzblau, S., Sprafkin, J. N., & Rubenstein, E. A. "Sex on TV: A Content Analysis." Journal of Communication, 27, 164-170.

Fredrich, L. K., & Stein, A. H. "Aggressive and Prosocial Television Programs and the Natural Behavior of Preschool Children." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1973, 38 (4, Serial No. 151).

Fredrich, L. K. & Stein, A. H. "Prosocial television and Young Children: The Effects of Verbal Labeling and Role Playing on Learning and Behavior." Child Development, 1975, 46, 27-38.

Gerbner, G. "Violence in Television Drama. Trends and Symbolic Functions." In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubenstein (eds.), Television and Social Behavior. Reports and Papers: Media Content and Control (Vol. 1). Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Greenberg, B. S., Atkin, C. K., Edison, N. G., & Korzenny, F. Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviors on Commercial Television in 1975-1976. Department of Communication: Michigan State University, 1977.

Himmelweit, H. T., Oppenheim, A. N., & Vince, P. Television and the Child. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Kohlberg, L. "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology." In M. L. Hoffman and L. W. Hoffman (eds.), Review of Developmental Research (Vol. 1). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Lesser, G. S. "Designing a Program for Broadcast Television." In F. F. Korten, S. W. Cook, and J. I. Lacey (eds.), Psychology and the Problems of Society. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1970.

Liebert, R. E. "Television and Children's Aggressive Behavior: Another Look." American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1974, 34, 99-107.

Liefer, A. D., Gordon, N. J., & Graves, S. B. "Children's Television More than Mere Entertainment." Harvard Education Review, 1974, 44, 213-245.

Lyle, J., Hoffman, H. R. "Children's Use of Television and Other Media." In G. A. Comstock & E. A. Rubenstein (eds.) Television and Social Behavior (Vol. 4), Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Sprafkin, J. N., Leibert, R. M., & Poulos, R. W. "Effects of a Prosocial Televised Example on Children's Helping." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1975, 20, 119-126.

Stein, A. H., & Fredrich, L. K. "Television Content and Young Children's Behavior." In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubenstein, and G. A. Comstock (eds.), Television and Social Behavior. Television and Social Learning (Vol. 2). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Weigel, R. H. & Jessor, R. "Television and Adolescent Conventionality: An Exploration Study." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1973, 37, 76-90.

FOOTNOTES

[1]This research was supported by a grant from the Communication Research Center at Brigham Young University. Thanks is extended to the Center's Director, Dr. Gordon Whiting, for his support and assistance in the planning, design, and execution of this experiment.

[2]The reader is referred to Leifer, A. D., Gordon, N., & Graves, S. B. "Children's Television More than Mere Entertainment," Harvard Educational Review, 44, 1974, 213-245, for an exhaustive review of the literature.

[3]The reader is referred to Greenburg, B. S., Atkin, C. K., Edison N. H., Korzenny, F. "Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviors on Commercial Television in 1975-1976." Department of Communication: Michigan State University, 1977, for an excellent review of Bandura's theory.

[4]This data is not reported because it was believed that the methodology did not provide adequate training to attain acceptable levels of reliability.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. A profile of significant differences between "Little House on the Prairie" and "Charlie's Angels."

Figure 2. A profile of significant differences between "Grizzly Adams" and "Lou Grant."

Table 1

Test Retest Correlations of Raters*

Raters	Little House on the Praire Charlie's Angels	Grizzly Adams Lou Grant
1	.69	.82
2	.76	.79
3	.57	.44
4	.62	.35
5	.33	.45
Total	.59	.56

Combined Total (Both Columns) = .58

*The critical value for significance is .43 ($P < .05$, two-tailed).

Table 2

F Ratios and Mean Scores for Differences Between Programs on Value Preference on Little House on the Prairie and Charlie's Angels

Dependent Variable	Means: Little House on the Prairie	Means: Charlie's Angels	F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
1. Motivated, ambitious, capable	5.8	3.9	2.612	.13
2. Responsible, hard working, self-controlled	6.1	4.6	0.936	.36
3. Broad minded, forgiving, considerate of others, loving	7.1	3.1	14.876	.02
4. Intelligent, logical, independent, imaginative	7.3	4.1	10.286	.03
5. Brave, courageous, valiant	5.5	7.0	1.352	.31
6. Friendly, cheerful, easy going	6.1	4.4	2.656	.18

Table 2 (Continued)

Dependent Variable	Means: Little House on the Prairie	Means: Charlie's Angels	F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
7. Virtuous, honest, loyal, obedient, clean	3.9	3.9	4.132	.95
8. Comfortable, secure harmonious life	6.4	4.1	3.063	.16
9. Accomplishment, service	6.1	2.2	8.768	.04
10. Respect, friendship, love of people	6.6	3.5	11.5000	.03
11. Freedom, equality, justice	4.2	3.3	.488	.52
12. Salvation, eternal life	2.3	0	4.239	.11
13. Pleasure, happiness, excitement	5.0	6.3	1.793	.25

*Degrees of freedom = F (1,4)

Table 3

F Ratios and Mean Scores for Differences between Programs on Moral Reasoning on Little House on the Prairie and Charlie's Angels

Dependent Variable	Means: Little House on the Prairie	Means: Charlie's Angels	F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
1. Utilization of egoism	4.8	6.4	2.994	.16
2. Utilization of deontology	3.5	2.5	24.500	.01
3. Utilization of utilitarianism	6.9	5.1	4.614	.10
4. Proportion that moral reason was based on a rule	3.9	2.9	1.607	.27
5. Proportion that moral reason was based on an act	7.0	7.4	.923	.39

Table 3 (Continued)

Dependent Variable	Means: Little House on the Prairie	Means: Charlie"s Angels	F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
6. Reinforcement of deontology	5.3	3.5	1.657	.27
7. Reinforcement of utilitarianism	6.8	6.8	1.030	.92
8. Reinforcement of egoism	4.8	4.1	2.951	.16

*Degrees of freedom = F (1,4).

Table 4

F Ratios and Mean Scores for Differences between Programs on Value Preference on Grizzly Adams and Lou Grant

Dependent Variable	Means		F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
	Grizzly Adams	Lou Grant		
1. Motivated, ambitious, capable	4.7	5.8	1.307	.32
2. Responsible, hard working, self-controlled	5.7	5.5	.407	.85
3. Broad minded, forgiving, considerate of others, loving	7.5	5.5	2.446	.19
4. Intelligent, logical, independent, imaginative	4.8	6.2	4.200	.11
5. Brave, courageous, valiant	6.5	5.8	.134	.73
6. Friendly, cheerful, easy going	6.1	2.9	10.425	.03
7. Virtuous, honest, loyal, obedient, clean	5.7	7.0	.881	.40

Table 4 (Continued)

Dependent Variable	Means		F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
	Grizzly Adams	Lou Grant		
8. Comfortable, secure	6.3	3.5	7.875	.05
9. Accomplishment, service	7.1	4.5	8.947	.04
10. Respect, friendship, love of people	8.2	5.7	26.237	.01
11. Freedom, equality, justice	3.5	5.2	2.097	.22
12. Salvation, eternal life	0.7	0	1.000	.37
13. Pleasure, happiness, excitement	3.9	1.9	45.000	.01

*Degrees of freedom $F = (1,4)$.

Table 5

F Ratios and Mean Scores for Differences between Programs on Moral Reasoning on Grizzly Adams and Lou Grant

Dependent Variable	Means		F Ratio* for Program Effect	Significance Level
	Grizzly Adams	Lou Grant		
1. Utilization of egoism	3.8	4.3	.131	.74
2. Utilization of deontology	3.1	4.3	7.606	.05
3. Utilization of utilitarianism	7.1	6.1	2.103	.22
4. Proportion that moral reason was based on a rule	6.3	4.8	8.672	.04
5. Proportion that moral reason was based on an act	4.3	5.8	52.900	.01
6. Reinforcement of deontology	3.7	3.5	6.428	.81
7. Reinforcement of utilitarianism	7.8	6.1	8.223	.05
8. Reinforcement of egoism	3.5	4.3	3.184	.15

*Degrees of freedom = F (1,4).

Table 6

Significant Differences Between Episodes of Grizzly Adams

Dependent Variable	Means: Episode 1 Adams saves the wolf	Means: Episode 2 Adams saves the mule	Means: Episode 3 Adams saves the hawk	Comparisons by episode Disignation*	F Ratio** for Episode Effect	Significance Level
Brave, courageous, valiant	3.6	7.6	8.2	1-2, 1-3	7.01	.01
Virtuous, honest, loyal, obedient, clean	8.0	3.2	5.8	1-2	3.98	.05
Utilization of egoism	5.6	4.0	1.8	1-3	9.50	.01
Utilization of utilitarianism	6.2	1.8	8.2	1-3	3.96	.05

*Newman-Kuel Test, (5), p .05.

**Degrees of freedom = F (4,16).